

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

STACEY KING,
Plaintiff,

V.

LAS VEGAS METROPOLITAN POLICE
DEPARTMENT, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:20-cv-00055-ART-NJK

Order

[Docket No. 80]

Pending before the Court is Plaintiff's motion to stay the undersigned's May 5, 2023, order imposing sanctions. Docket No. 80. *See also* Docket No. 79 (sanctions order). Defendants have filed a response and the time to do so has now passed. *See* Docket.

The Court ordered Plaintiff to pay Defendants \$2,435 by June 30, 2023, as a sanction for his abusive and bad-faith discovery conduct. Docket No. 79 at 18. Plaintiff now seeks to stay the compliance deadline pending resolution of his objection to the sanctions order. Docket No. 80 at 2. *See also* Docket No. 82 (Plaintiff's objection).

Failure to respond to a motion constitutes consent to the granting of the motion. Local Rule 7-2(d). Accordingly, the Court **GRANTS** Plaintiff's motion to stay the undersigned's May 5, 2023, order imposing sanctions.¹ Docket No. 80.

¹ A magistrate judge's non-dispositive pretrial order may only be modified or set aside by a district judge if the order is "clearly erroneous or is contrary to law." Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(a).

“[C]ourts adjudicate motions to stay a magistrate judge's non-dispositive order by analyzing: (1) whether the movant is likely to succeed on its objection; (2) whether the movant will suffer irreparable injury in the absence of a stay; (3) whether the other parties will be substantially injured by a stay; and (4) where the public interest lies.”

PlayUp, Inc. v. Mintas, --- F. Supp. 3d ---, 2022 WL 10967692, at *3 (D. Nev. 2022). The deferential standard of review means a party seeking to stay a magistrate judge's non-dispositive pretrial order faces "a steep hill to climb." *Id.*

Plaintiff's conclusory submissions fail to clear the "difficult hurdles" required to stay a magistrate judge's non-dispositive pretrial order. *Id.* The Court grants Plaintiff's motion to stay

1 Plaintiff must pay to Defendants any sanctions amount upheld no later than 14 days after
2 the issuance of the order resolving his objection.

3 IT IS SO ORDERED.

4 Dated: June 27, 2023

5 
6 Nancy J. Koppe
7 United States Magistrate Judge

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 solely because Defendants have consented to the motion being granted by failing to file a response.
28 This order should not be construed as any sort of opinion regarding the merits of Plaintiff's motion
to stay or objection to the Court's sanctions order.